



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WY  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,007	09/25/2003	Wendy H. Raskind	UWOTL121680	8123
26389	7590	06/30/2006		EXAMINER
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			JOHANNSEN, DIANA B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/671,007	RASKIND ET AL.
Examiner	Diana B. Johannsen	Art Unit 1634

**– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2004.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) 1-42 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All   b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-8, drawn to methods of identifying genetic mutations, classified in at least, for example, class 435, subclasses 6 and 91.2.
  - II. Claims 9-16, drawn to isolated nucleic acids, classified in at least, for example, class 536, subclass 23.2.
  - III. Claims 17-29, drawn to methods of screening for a predisposition for an ataxic neurological disease , classified in at least, for example, class 435, subclass 6 and 91.2.
  - IV. Claims 30-42, drawn to kits comprising primers, classified in at least, for example, class 536, subclass 24.33.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:  
Inventions I and III are drawn to patentably distinct methods having different objectives and requiring different process steps. Invention requires a step of, e.g., identifying a difference between a nucleic acid sequence of an ataxic subject and that of another subject that is not ataxic to achieve the objective of identifying disease associated mutations. In contrast, Invention III requires a step of analyzing the nucleic acid of a subject for the presence of a mutation known to be associated with an ataxic neurological disease to achieve the objective of screening for genetic predisposition for disease. Although the two Inventions share a common classification, the inventions require different text searches using different terms. Accordingly, examination of the inventions together would impose a serious search burden.

Inventions II and IV are drawn to patentably distinct products. Although the primers of Invention IV and the molecules of Invention II are each composed of nucleotides, the primers and molecules differ from one another in both structure and functional properties, and the two Inventions require different text searches as well as different sequence searches. Additionally, the two Inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Accordingly, examination of the inventions together would impose a serious search burden.

Inventions I and II, and I and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the products of Inventions II and IV may be used in materially different processes, such as methods of genomic mapping. Additionally, the Inventions require different text searches, and have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. A search of more than one of the Inventions would therefore pose a serious burden.

Inventions III and II, and III and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the products of Inventions II and IV may be used in materially different processes, such as

methods of genomic mapping. Additionally, the Inventions require different text and sequence searches, and have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. A search of more than one of the Inventions would therefore pose a serious burden.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter, and because Inventions I-IV require different sequence and text searches that are not co-extensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

a) With regard to Group II, the 7 different mutation-containing nucleic acids of dependent claims 10-16 (each of which is also encompassed by generic claim 9). Each such nucleic acid is distinct from each other nucleic acid by virtue of having a different sequence/structure and different functional properties. Further, each sequence requires a different sequence search, and therefore a search of more than one such sequence would pose a serious burden. Accordingly, if Group II is elected, Applicant should further elect a single nucleic acid for examination.

b) With regard to Group III, the 7 different mutations of dependent claims 23-29 (each of which is also encompassed by generic claim 22). Each such mutation is distinct from each other mutation by virtue of having a different sequence/structure and different functional properties. Further, each mutation requires a different search, and

therefore a search of more than one such mutation would pose a serious burden.

Accordingly, if Group III is elected, Applicant should further elect a single mutation for examination.

c) With regard to Group IV, the 7 different mutations of claims 34-41 and the accompanying primer combinations of dependent claims 35-41. Each such mutation is distinct from each other mutation by virtue of having a different sequence/structure and different functional properties. Further, each mutation requires a different search, as does each combination of primers, and therefore a search of more than one such mutation and associated primer pair combination would pose a serious burden.

Accordingly, if Group IV is elected, Applicant should further elect a single mutation for examination, as well as an associated primer pair combination.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species (as noted above) for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.** Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain

dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diana B. Johannsen whose telephone number is 571/272-0744. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday, 7:30 am-4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached at 571/272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/671,007  
Art Unit: 1634

Page 9



Diana B. Johannsen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1634